

USIA SURVEY

Memorandum of Meeting of 26 May 1954
1778 Pennsylvania Avenue, 10:00 to 12:00

Member of Survey: Mr. James Q. Reber, CIA

Observers: USIA Mr. Louis T. Olom, CPI
Miss Winifred Farah, IRI/R
Mr. William Handley, Dep. Ch. PAO, New Delhi

State Mr. Sidney Buford, OLI
Mr. Fisher Howe, Deputy Special Assistant,
Intelligence
Mr. George A. Pope, IAD
Mr. Allan Evans, OIR
Mr. Clyde Dunn, DRN
Mr. Walter K. Schwinn, P
Mr. James H. Boughton, NEA/P

OCB Mr. Charles Taquey

CIA [REDACTED]

25X1A

SUBJECT: Meeting to Discuss Memorandum of 20 May 1954 on
USIA Intelligence Survey, Facilities and Methods of
Meeting the Types of Intelligence for the USIS Program
for India

1. NIE's will be helpful in the field, particularly in regard to planning for one and two years ahead. It was felt that further advice to the Embassy with respect to making available to USIA personnel NIE's and State Department Weekly Summaries was probably not desirable and that rather USIA should notify its USIA personnel of the dispatch of such, thus alerting them to obtain these documents.

2. Current intelligence evaluating the seriousness of developments and trends could help USIA personnel in making changes in emphasis in their work.

State Dept. declassification & release instructions on file

3. It would be helpful to USIS if it could match estimates of the critical areas of influence in India against a situation summary of where the Communists are currently weak and where strong.

4. Mr. Handley suggested possibilities of a sort of NIS on selected cities which in effect would be an analysis of targets, it being understood that in general USIA stays out of the villages except indirectly through its cooperation with TCA.

5. PAO reporting:

a. There was considerable discussion of the possibility for intelligence reporting by public affairs officers and their staffs. Mr. Handley pointed out the dangers that might arise through the attempt to obtain information from local employees, who, after all, owe their alliance to their own government. He did recognize that the written reports currently submitted by mobile units every two months could be submitted to Washington. He doubted it would be wise to go any further. While additional information is secured through discussing the trips with the local employees, it must be remembered that preparing reports takes time away from operations and that there is always a shortage of clerical help.

b. He called attention to the limitation on political reporting of public affairs officers, this being a province reserved for other functional assignments. The imposition of reporting requirements by USIA would, it was recognized by all at the meeting, require making arrangements for such positions within the Department and within the Embassy. It was suggested that insofar as PAOs were themselves alert to the needs of an information program and briefed on the requirements of the headquarters they would be logically inclined to observe as a normal matter many things of interest. If the PAO could report these periodically it would be helpful. It was also thought that a limited requirement levied no oftener than once a month or every two months might be a beginning that would be fairly realistic.

c. It was suggested that one means of increasing reporting of such data might be through the use of USIA public opinion survey and research teams going abroad.